

**From:** [OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK](#)  
**To:** [Martinez, Jacquelynn](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Comment on public defender caseload standards  
**Date:** Thursday, September 19, 2024 12:11:03 PM

---

---

**From:** Rekart, Emma <erekart@kingcounty.gov>  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 19, 2024 11:39 AM  
**To:** OFFICE RECEPTIONIST, CLERK <SUPREME@COURTS.WA.GOV>  
**Subject:** Comment on public defender caseload standards

**External Email Warning!** This email has originated from outside of the Washington State Courts Network. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender, are expecting the email, and know the content is safe. If a link sends you to a website where you are asked to validate using your Account and Password, **DO NOT DO SO!** Instead, report the incident.

Justices of the Washington State Supreme Court,

I am writing in support of the proposed court rule amendments to codify the WSBA's recently passed criminal caseload standards for public defenders. The WSBA Board of Governors approved these long-overdue updates to the maximum workload public defenders can reasonably be expected to carry for a simple and obvious reason: They recognized the status quo has required public defenders like me to compromise our ethical obligations to our clients.

This is not an academic matter – as unsustainable workloads drive my experienced colleagues out of public defense, those of us who remain are forced to take on more and more cases carrying potential life-altering consequences for our clients. We do everything we can to vindicate our clients' constitutional right to a speedy trial, but with near-constant trials many clients have no choice but to continue their case – and prolong their pre-trial incarceration – until their latest attorney has capacity to prepare for yet another trial.

I know you will hear from institutional actors claiming that these standards are impractical or would be prohibitively expensive. These concerns are real, but they cannot justify continuing a status quo that makes a mockery out of most clients' constitutional right to a speedy trial. My colleagues and I are already stretched to our breaking point.

Without the relief that these caseloads would bring, the quality of the representation I can provide to people who do not have the ability to choose their own lawyer will continue to get worse. At some point, I will reach the same conclusion as many of my former colleagues: I can no longer practice in public defense while claiming to honor my ethical obligations to my clients.

The Supreme Court did not condition the right to an attorney on a government's ability to afford one when it decided *Gideon v. Wainwright*. They rightly placed the obligation to find funding to pay for a public defender at public expense on the government seeking to take away an indigent person's

liberty.

When deciding whether that right means my clients deserve someone with the time and capacity to zealously represent them, that is the example this Court should follow. I urge you to adopt the proposed court rules that would codify the WSBA's caseload standards for public defenders so the right enshrined in *Gideon* entitles my clients to more than just a warm body with a bar card.

**Emma Rekart** (she/her/ella)

Attorney

Northwest Defenders Division

Department of Public Defense

710 Second Avenue, Suite 250

Seattle, WA 98104

Phone: (206) 674-4700

Fax: (206) 674-4702

This message is intended for the use of the individual or entity which it is emailed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable laws. If the reader of this communication is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received the communication in error, please notify us immediately by telephone or email.